UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,663	02/23/2004	Andrew J. Vilcauskas JR.	KLR/KAR:8096.0010	2280

152   7590   05/08/2007
CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL
1600 ODS TOWER
601 SW SECOND AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204-3157

EXAMINER
WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 February 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>19-24,26-34 and 36-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>19-24,26-34 and 36-41</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 February 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The Applicants' amendment, filed 23 February 2007, has been received, entered

into the record, and considered.

2.   As a result of the amendment, claims 20-23, 26 and 30-33 have been amended,

claims 25 and 35 have been canceled, and new claims 40 and 41 have been added.

Claims 20-24, 26-34 and 36-41 are now presented for examination.

The Invention

3.   The claimed invention is drawn to a method of presenting advertisements in a

computer system through the use of popunder windows. Alternative claimed

embodiments are implemented in other media, such as a PDA, telephone, television

and radio.

Priority

4.   The Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 as a divisional

application based upon application 09/866,425, filed 24 May 2001, which claims priority

under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e), to provisional application 60/207,698, filed 26 May 2000, is

acknowledged. Since the subject matter of the parent provisional application

encompasses that of the instant application and claims, a priority date of 26 May 2000 is

hereby established.

Double Patenting

5.   In view of the Applicants' amendments to the claims, the pending double

patenting claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are withdrawn.

6.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created
doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the
unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent
and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory
obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims
are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct
from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated
by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140
F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d
2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van
Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ
619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d)
may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory
double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown
to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of
activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a
terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply
with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7.   Claims 20, 26, 30 and 36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 26, 27, 36 and 37

of copending Application No. 09/866,425. Although the conflicting claims are not

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the differences, such

as whether a foreground window obscures a background window, are inherent in the

nature of a window as a foreground and/or background window, said terms being

given their customary and ordinary meaning in the art.

        This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the

conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Objections

8.   Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities: in limitation (c),

the term 'post session' is used without a hyphen, inconsistent with its use throughout

the claims.

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
        obviousness or nonobviousness.

11.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were

made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under

37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not

commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12.   Claims 20-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Werkhoven (International Publication WO 1999/59097) in view of **Landsman et al.** (U.S.

Patent Application Publication 2003/0004804).

13.   Regarding claim 20, **Werkhoven** teaches a system for Internet advertising for use

in a media capable of simultaneously maintaining a foreground window and at least

one background window and capable of displaying plural browsers, each in a selective

one of said foreground window and a said background window, said browsers for

selectively browsing the Internet substantially as claimed, said system comprising:

     a) a script handler (see disclosure that the system is implemented in a browser

          scripting language such as JavaScript, page 3, lines 3-4) that invokes a post-

          session procedure in a first browser, said post-session procedure opening a

          second browser in a said background window while said first browser is

          simultaneously displayed in said foreground window, said first browser in

said foreground window obscuring at least a portion of said second

browser in said background window (see disclosure that the advertisement

is loaded into a background window, page 3, lines 8-10; see also step 3 in

drawing Figure 1); wherein

b) an advertisement is loaded into said second browser while said second

browser is in a said background window (see step 4 in drawing Figure 1);

and wherein

c) said first browser is moved to a said background window and said second

browser is moved to a foreground window obscuring at least a portion of

said first browser (see disclosure that upon loading, the ad is brought to the

foreground and "played", page 4, lines 4-5; see also steps 5 and 6, drawing

Figure 1).

Werkhoven does not explicitly teach a system including an event handler that

receives from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded into the

second browser.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a system wherein an event handler receives

from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded into the second

browser (see disclosure that a referring page has an 'advertising tag' embedded therein, which transparently downloads advertising files originating from an advertisement management system residing on a third party advertising server, paragraphs [0036] and [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to receive links to advertisements for downloading to a second browser, since this would preclude the need to embed advertisements in HTML files in a web page, which would likely provide considerable economies to advertisers in saved labor, time and cost in terms of both inserting advertisements into web pages and later changing any of those advertisements (see paragraphs [0019] and [0033]).

Werkhoven additionally does not explicitly teach a system including an event handler which monitors a click-stream and moves the second browser from the background to the foreground in response to a view triggering event.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a system including an event handler which monitors a click-stream (defined in paragraph [0133] as any user-initiated transition to a new content page, whether it is a mouse click, key depression or history state change)

and displays advertisements in response to a view triggering event (see disclosure of an

agent that monitors a click-stream generated by a user, and in response to a user-

initiated action which instructs the client browser to transition to a next successive

content web page, displays a downloaded advertisement (see paragraph [0038] and

[0109].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to only display the advertisement (by moving the second browser from the

background to the foreground) in response to a view triggering event, since this would

display the advertisement 'interstitially', in an interval of time that occurs after a user

has clicked on a hot-link displayed by a browser to retrieve a desired web page but

before the browser has started rendering that page (see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]),

and because interstitial play advantageously permits previously downloaded content

rich advertisements to be played through the browser without adversely affecting

communication link bandwidth then available to the client browser (see paragraph

[0038]),and furthermore because employing a user click-stream to trigger play of

downloaded advertisements frees the user, for receiving advertising, of any need either

to undertake any affirmative action, other than normal web browsing, or to learn any

new procedure, thus advantageously imposing no added burden on the user (see

paragraph [0039])

14.   Regarding claim 30, **Werkhoven** teaches a post-session advertising method for

use in a media capable of simultaneously maintaining a foreground window and at

least one background window and capable of displaying plural browsers, each in a

selective one of said foreground window and a said background window substantially

as claimed, said method comprising the steps of:

> a) embedding post-session instructions into a first browser displayed in a said
>
> foreground window (see disclosure of three methods of embedding
>
> JavaScript instructions into a web page, page 5, lines 1-15);
>
> b) said post-session procedure opening a second browser in a said background
>
> window while said first browser is simultaneously displayed in said
>
> foreground window, said first browser in said foreground window
>
> obscuring at least a portion of said second browser (see disclosure that the
>
> advertisement is loaded into a background window, page 3, lines 8-10; see
>
> also step 3 in drawing Figure 1);

c) loading said advertisement into said second browser while said second

browser is in a said background window (see step 4 in drawing Figure 1);

and

d) moving said first browser to a said background window and said second

browser is moved to a foreground window obscuring at least a portion of

said first browser (see disclosure that upon loading, the ad is brought to the

foreground and "played", page 4, lines 4-5; see also steps 5 and 6, drawing

Figure 1).

Werkhoven does not explicitly teach a method wherein said post-session

instructions receive from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded

into the second browser.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a method wherein said post-session

instructions receive from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded

into the second browser (see disclosure that a referring page has an 'advertising tag'

embedded therein, which transparently downloads advertising files originating from an

advertisement management system residing on a third party advertising server,

paragraphs [0036] and [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to receive links to advertisements for downloading to a second browser, since

this would preclude the need to embed advertisements in HTML files in a web page,

which would likely provide considerable economies to advertisers in saved labor, time

and cost in terms of both inserting advertisements into web pages and later changing

any of those advertisements (see paragraphs [0019] and [0033]).

Werkhoven additionally does not explicitly teach a method including an event

handler which monitors a click-stream and moves the second browser from the

background to the foreground in response to a view triggering event.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a method including monitoring a click-stream

(defined in paragraph [0133] as any user-initiated transition to a new content page,

whether it is a mouse click, key depression or history state change) and displays

advertisements in response to a view triggering event (see disclosure of an agent that

monitors a click-stream generated by a user, and in response to a user-initiated action

which instructs the client browser to transition to a next successive content web page,

displays a downloaded advertisement (see paragraph [0038] and [0109].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to only display the advertisement (by moving the second browser from the

background to the foreground) in response to a view triggering event, since this would

display the advertisement 'interstitially', in an interval of time that occurs after a user

has clicked on a hot-link displayed by a browser to retrieve a desired web page but

before the browser has started rendering that page (see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]),

and because interstitial play advantageously permits previously downloaded content

rich advertisements to be played through the browser without adversely affecting

communication link bandwidth then available to the client browser (see paragraph

[0038]),and furthermore because employing a user click-stream to trigger play of

downloaded advertisements frees the user, for receiving advertising, of any need either

to undertake any affirmative action, other than normal web browsing, or to learn any

new procedure, thus advantageously imposing no added burden on the user (see

paragraph [0039])

15.   Regarding claim 40, **Werkhoven** teaches a system for Internet advertising for use

in a media capable of simultaneously maintaining a foreground window and at least

one background window and capable of displaying plural browsers, each in a selective

one of said foreground window and a said background window, said browsers for

selectively browsing the Internet substantially as claimed, said system comprising:

      a) a script handler (see disclosure that the system is implemented in a browser

           scripting language such as JavaScript, page 3, lines 3-4) that invokes a post-

           session procedure in a first browser, said post-session procedure opening a

           second browser in a said background window while said first browser is

           simultaneously displayed in said foreground window, said first browser in

           said foreground window obscuring at least a portion of said second

           browser in said background window (see disclosure that the advertisement

           is loaded into a background window, page 3, lines 8-10; see also step 3 in

           drawing Figure 1); wherein

      b) an advertisement is loaded into said second browser while said second

           browser is in a said background window (see step 4 in drawing Figure 1);

           and wherein

      c) said post-session instructions are free from instructions moving said second

           browser to a said foreground window that obscures any portion of said

           first browser (see disclosure that the content loaded in the second browser

           [i.e., popup window] can itself be responsible for bringing itself to the front

when loaded, meaning by implication that the post-session instructions,

which are executed in the first browser, are free from instructions moving

said second browser to a said foreground window as claimed, page 5, lines

17-19).

Werkhoven does not explicitly teach a system including an event handler that

receives from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded into the

second browser.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a system wherein an event handler receives

from an Internet address a link to an advertisement to be loaded into the second

browser (see disclosure that a referring page has an 'advertising tag' embedded therein,

which transparently downloads advertising files originating from an advertisement

management system residing on a third party advertising server, paragraphs [0036] and

[0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to receive links to advertisements for downloading to a second browser, since

this would preclude the need to embed advertisements in HTML files in a web page,

which would likely provide considerable economies to advertisers in saved labor, time

and cost in terms of both inserting advertisements into web pages and later changing

any of those advertisements (see paragraphs [0019] and [0033]).

Werkhoven additionally does not explicitly teach a system including an event

handler which monitors a click-stream and moves the second browser from the

background to the foreground in response to a view triggering event.

Landsman et al., however, teaches a system including an event handler which

monitors a click-stream (defined in paragraph [0133] as any user-initiated transition to a

new content page, whether it is a mouse click, key depression or history state change)

and displays advertisements in response to a view triggering event (see disclosure of an

agent that monitors a click-stream generated by a user, and in response to a user-

initiated action which instructs the client browser to transition to a next successive

content web page, displays a downloaded advertisement, paragraph [0038] and [0109]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to only display the advertisement (by moving the second browser from the

background to the foreground) in response to a view triggering event, since this would

display the advertisement 'interstitially', in an interval of time that occurs after a user

has clicked on a hot-link displayed by a browser to retrieve a desired web page but

before the browser has started rendering that page (see paragraphs [0016] and [0017]),

and because interstitial play advantageously permits previously downloaded content

rich advertisements to be played through the browser without adversely affecting

communication link bandwidth then available to the client browser (see paragraph

[0038]),and furthermore because employing a user click-stream to trigger play of

downloaded advertisements frees the user, for receiving advertising, of any need either

to undertake any affirmative action, other than normal web browsing, or to learn any

new procedure, thus advantageously imposing no added burden on the user (see

paragraph [0039])

16.   Regarding claims 21 and 31, **Werkhoven** additionally teaches a system and

method wherein said first browser completely obscures said second browser at a time

prior to said view triggering event (see disclosure that if the browser supports it, the

content will be loaded into a window while it is in the background and then moved to

the foreground, page 3, lines 8-10).

17.   Regarding claims 22 and 32, **Werkhoven** additionally teaches a system and

method where said second browser is opened in response to a load-triggering event

that comprises at least one of clicking on an off-site link, entering a new address,

refreshing a web site, exiting a web site, and being redirected to a web site (see

disclosure that JavaScript code for opening the window in the background is embedded

in the referring web page, meaning that the load-triggering event is the loading of the

referring web page, analogous to at least both the refreshing of and the redirection to a

web site, since they both would result in the download and display of a web page, page

5, lines 1-15).

18.   Regarding claims 23, 24, 33 and 34, **Landsman et al.** additionally teaches a

system and method wherein said script handler delays invocation of said post-session

procedure for a predetermined period of time, and wherein said script handler cancels

invocation of said post-session procedure if a user loads a new web site in said first

browser before said predetermined time period has elapsed (see disclosure of the timer

based frame targeted advertisements, paragraph [0159]).

19.   Regarding claims 26 and 36, **Landsman et al.** additionally teaches a system and

method including a focus timer that tracks the duration that said second browser is

displayed in said foreground window (see paragraph [0050]).

20.   Regarding claims 27 and 37, **Landsman et al.** additionally teaches a system and

method wherein said media comprises one of a computer, a PDA, a cell phone and a

television (see disclosure that the system is executed in a computer, Abstract).

21.   Regarding claims 28 and 38, **Landsman et al.** additionally teaches a system and

method wherein said event handler selects and returns one of a plurality of

advertisements maintained at said Internet address (see paragraph [0104]).

22.   Regarding claims 29 and 39, **Werkhoven** additionally teaches a system and

method capable of opening a plurality of second browsers, each maintained in a

separate background window, said event handler capable of receiving a link to an

advertisement for each browser and loading a respective said advertisement into each

said second browser while each said second browser remains in its respective said

background window (see disclosure of prior art systems where a new window is

opened every time a user attempts to view the top level (home page) of a site, thus

resulting in multiple windows being generated, page 3, lines 33-37).

23.   Regarding claim 41, **Landsman et al.** additionally teaches a system and method

wherein the advertisement is completely obscured by said first browser at a time

immediately subsequent to said advertisement being completely loaded into said

second browser (see disclosure of an agent that monitors a click-stream generated by a

user, and in response to a user-initiated action which instructs the client browser to

transition to a next successive content web page, displays a downloaded advertisement,

paragraph [0038] and [0109]).

Response to Arguments

24.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the combination of the **Landsman et al.**

and **PornRodeo** references have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

25.   Applicant's arguments regarding claims 40 and 41 have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants argue that independent claim 40 includes the limitation the said

first and second browsers are free from instructions moving said second browser to a

said foreground window, but the claim language cites only the post-session instructions

being free from such instructions. Post-session instructions are executed only by the

first (foreground) browser.

The prior art cited in the rejection of claims 40 and 41 discloses a system wherein

in at least one embodiment the foreground browser includes no instructions for moving

the background browser to the foreground; see page 5, lines 17-19, as cited in the

rejection of record.

Conclusion

26.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Shuster (U.S. Patent 6,904,453) teaches a method and system for directing access

to content on a computer network.

Shuster (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0001863) teaches a method and

system for directing access to content on a computer network.

Shuster (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0169829) teaches a method and

system for directing access to content on a computer network.

Werkhoven (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0048293) teaches a method

of providing Internet advertisements through the generation of a background window

which is loaded with an advertisement and then displayed in the foreground.

Werkhoven (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0096983) teaches a method

of providing Internet advertisements through the generation of a background window

which is loaded with an advertisement and then displayed in the foreground.

Shuster (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0203996) teaches a method and

system for directing access to content on a computer network.

Werkhoven (International Publication WO 2004/107224) teaches a method of

providing Internet advertisements through the generation of a background window

which is loaded with an advertisement and then displayed in the foreground.

Festa ("GeoCitizens Bristle at Pop-Up Ads") discusses the impact of the

introduction of pop-up ads on the GeoCities web hosting service.

Kornblum ("N.Y. Times Tries Pop-Up Ads") discusses the impact of the

introduction of pop-up ads on the New York Times web site.

Creative Edge Internet Services ("Welcome to Creative Edge Internet Services")

discloses the feature of the Netbreak system.

McCloskey ("Rich Media Down Under") discusses the events of Adforum 2000,

including news about Creative Edge Internet Services and their Netbreak service.

Weintraub ("Trends Report - Internet Arbitrage: A Short History") discloses

evidence that the widespread adoption of pop-under advertising did not occur until the

second quarter of 2001.

SpecificMedia ("About Us > Our Team > Tim Vanderhook") discloses evidence

that the pop-under advertising unit of Specific Media, Inc. was not created until some

time in 2001.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 571-272-4119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 571-273-4119. <u>Such communications must be clearly marked as</u> <u>INFORMAL, DRAFT or UNOFFICIAL.</u>

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (571) 272-2100, or fax (571) 273-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Luke S. Wassum
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

lsw
7 May 2007